I/W

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Notice of Allowability	09/775,184	JACOBSON, ROBERT L.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Doug Hutton	2179

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address--

All claims being allowable, PROSECUTION ON THE MERITS IS (OR REMAINS) CLOSED in this application. If not included herewith (or previously mailed), a Notice of Allowance (PTOL-85) or other appropriate communication will be mailed in due course. **THIS NOTICE OF ALLOWABILITY IS NOT A GRANT OF PATENT RIGHTS.** This application is subject to withdrawal from issue at the initiative of the Office or upon petition by the applicant. See 37 CFR 1.313 and MPEP 1308.

1. ☒ This communication is responsive to _Applicant's Response dated 23 November 2004_.

2. ☒ The allowed claim(s) is/are _1,3-17,20-28,30-54,57 and 60_.

3. ☒ The drawings filed on _27 June 2001_ are accepted by the Examiner.

4. ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a) ☐ All   b) ☐ Some*   c) ☐ None of the:

      1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

      3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * Certified copies not received: _____ .

Applicant has THREE MONTHS FROM THE "MAILING DATE" of this communication to file a reply complying with the requirements noted below. Failure to timely comply will result in ABANDONMENT of this application. **THIS THREE-MONTH PERIOD IS NOT EXTENDABLE.**

5. ☐ A SUBSTITUTE OATH OR DECLARATION must be submitted. Note the attached EXAMINER'S AMENDMENT or NOTICE OF INFORMAL PATENT APPLICATION (PTO-152) which gives reason(s) why the oath or declaration is deficient.

6. ☐ CORRECTED DRAWINGS (as "replacement sheets") must be submitted.

    (a) ☐ including changes required by the Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) attached

      1) ☐ hereto or 2) ☐ to Paper No./Mail Date _____ .

    (b) ☐ including changes required by the attached Examiner's Amendment / Comment or in the Office action of

      Paper No./Mail Date _____ .

Identifying indicia such as the application number (see 37 CFR 1.84(c)) should be written on the drawings in the front (not the back) of each sheet. Replacement sheet(s) should be labeled as such in the header according to 37 CFR 1.121(d).

7. ☐ DEPOSIT OF and/or INFORMATION about the deposit of BIOLOGICAL MATERIAL must be submitted. Note the attached Examiner's comment regarding REQUIREMENT FOR THE DEPOSIT OF BIOLOGICAL MATERIAL.

Attachment(s)

1. ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2. ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3. ☒ Information Disclosure Statements (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08), Paper No./Mail Date _10 November 2004_

4. ☐ Examiner's Comment Regarding Requirement for Deposit of Biological Material

5. ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6. ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413), Paper No./Mail Date _____ .

7. ☒ Examiner's Amendment/Comment

8. ☒ Examiner's Statement of Reasons for Allowance

9. ☐ Other _____ .

EXAMINER'S AMENDMENT

An examiner's amendment to the record appears below. Should the changes and/or additions be unacceptable to applicant, an amendment may be filed as provided by 37 CFR 1.312. To ensure consideration of such an amendment, it MUST be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee.

Authorization for this examiner's amendment was given in a telephone interview with Kimberly K. Baxter on 8 March 2005.

Amend the application as follows:

In the Claims:

➢ in Claim 7, Line 1 → amend "2" to — 1 —;

➢ replace Claim 16, as follows:

16.   A method of locating and correcting a legal case citation in an open document that is being edited by a word processing application, comprising the steps of:

- automatically scanning said open document for said legal case citation;

- locating said legal case citation within said open document;

- identifying an error within said legal case citation as compared against a predetermined legal case citation standard; and

- automatically correcting said error within said legal case citation within said open document according to said predetermined legal case citation standard.

➢ cancel Claim 18;

➢ in Claim 21, Line 2 → amend "element" to — elements —;

➢ in Claim 23, Line 1 → amend "18" to — 16 —;

➢ in Claim 24, Line 1 → amend "18" to — 16 —;

➢ in Claim 25, Line 1 → amend "18" to — 16 —;

➢ in Claim 26, Line 1 → amend "18" to — 16 —;

➢ in Claim 28, Line 10 → amend "processing document" to — processing document according to said predetermined legal case citation standard —;

➢ in Claim 34, Line 1 → amend "29" to — 28 —;

➢ in Claim 41, Line 13 → amend "said legal case citation" to — a legal case citation
—;

➢ in Claim 41, Lines 15-16 → amend "for an error in stylistic accuracy" to — for
errors in stylistic accuracy as compared against said rules —;

➢ in Claim 41, Line 18 → amend "a detected error" to — said errors —;

➢ in Claim 47, Line 6 → amend "document" to — document as compared against a
legal case citation standard_—;

➢ in Claim 47, Line 9 → amend "automatically correcting said error within said open
word processing document" to — automatically correcting said error within said
legal case citation within said open document according to said predetermined
legal case citation standard —;

➢ in Claim 54, Lines 5-6 → amend "document and automatically correcting the
error within the legal case citation within the open word processing document
according to the legal case citation standard" to — document, identifying an error
within the legal case citation within the open word processing document as
compared against a legal case citation standard and automatically correcting the

error within the legal case citation within the open word processing document

according to the legal case citation standard —;

> cancel Claim 55;

> replace Claim 57, as follows:

    57.   A legal citation checker comprising a computer-readable medium

encoded with a computer program, wherein said computer program

comprises:

- a first component that enables the legal citation checker to operate

  as a plug-in to a word processing application; and

- a second component, operable with the first component, that

  operates to locate a legal case citation within an open word

  processing document,

wherein said second component operates to identify an error within the

legal case citation as compared against a legal case citation standard and

automatically correct the legal case citation within said open word

processing document in conformance with the legal case citation

standard.

> cancel Claim 58;

> ➢ cancel Claim 59.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 1, 3-17, 20-28, 30-54, 57 and 60 are allowed.

The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance:

Claims 1, 16, 28, 47, 54 and 57:

The closest prior art is Supnik, which discloses the "CiteRite" and "Full Authority" software programs. These programs perform the following operations:

- locating a legal case citation within a word processing document;

- identifying an error within said legal case citation within said word processing document as compared against a predetermined legal case citation standard; and

- automatically correcting a format of legal case citations within a **separate** Table of Authorities according to said predetermined legal case citation standard.

However, the "CiteRite" and "Full Authority" software programs fail to disclose or suggest automatically correcting a format of legal case citations **within the word processing document** according to said predetermined legal case citation standard.

The prior art also discloses:

- identifying errors within text of a word processing document; and

- automatically correcting said text.

However, the prior art fails to disclose or suggest automatically correcting an error *in a legal case citation* within a word processing document *according to a legal case citation standard*.

Accordingly, the novel and unobvious feature of the present invention comprises automatically correcting an error *in a legal case citation within a word processing document according to a legal case citation standard*.

Claims 3-15, 17, 20-27, 30-40, 48-53 and 60:

These claims are dependent upon Claims 1, 16, 28, 47 and 57 and thus include allowable subject matter.

Claim 41:

Similarly, the closest prior art is Supnik, which discloses the "CiteRite" and "Full Authority" software programs. These programs perform the following operations:

- locating a legal case citation within a word processing document;

- testing said legal case citation for errors in stylistic accuracy as compared against a plurality of stylistic accuracy rules for a plurality of legal jurisdictions; and

- automatically correcting said errors in stylistic accuracy within a *separate* Table of Authorities.

However, the "CiteRite" and "Full Authority" software programs fail to disclose or

suggest automatically correcting said errors in stylistic accuracy *within the word*

processing document according to said plurality of stylistic accuracy rules for the

plurality of legal jurisdictions.

The prior art also discloses:

- identifying errors within text of a word processing document; and

- automatically correcting said text.

However, the prior art fails to disclose or suggest automatically correcting errors in

stylistic accuracy *in a legal case citation* within a word processing document

according to a plurality of stylistic accuracy rules for a plurality of legal

jurisdictions.

Accordingly, the novel and unobvious feature of the present invention comprises

automatically correcting errors *in a legal case citation within a word processing*

document according a plurality of stylistic accuracy rules for a plurality of legal

jurisdictions.

Claims 42-46:

These claims are dependent upon Claim 41 and thus include allowable subject

matter.

Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later

than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably

accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on

Statement of Reasons for Allowance."

    Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the
examiner should be directed to Doug Hutton whose telephone number is (571) 272-
4137. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:00 AM to 5:00
PM.

    If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's
supervisor, Heather Herndon, can be reached at (571) 272-4136. The fax phone
number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703)
872-9306.

    Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or
proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-
2100.

WDH
March 8, 2005.

HEATHER R. HERNDON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100